Examiner-Initiated Interview Summ	10/563,547	EVANS, ANDREW JAMES	
Lanimer-minated interview Summ	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kim M. Lewis	3772	
All Participants: Status of Application:			
(1) Kim M. Lewis.	(3)		
(2) <u>Mark Abumeri</u> .	(4)		
Date of Interview: 8 November 2007	Time:		
Type of Interview:  ☑ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant	☐ Applicant's representative)		·
Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:			
Part I. Rejection(s) discussed:			
rejection(s) discussed.			
Claims discussed:			
Prior art documents discussed: N/A			
Part II.			
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet			
Part III.			
<ul> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.</li> </ul>			
(Examiner/SPE Signature)	(Applicant/Applicant's Repres	entative Signature – if appropria	te)

Application No.

Applicant(s)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner telephoned applicant's attorney in order to discuss support for language added to claim 1 in the amendment of 8/27/07. Specifically, the examiner indicated that there was not support for both the sealed enclosure and the sealed cuff. During a subsequent telephone call, applicant's attorney indicated that the specification disclosed an embodiment wherein the enclosure can be sealed and that the cuffs can be located at the ends of the enclosure.